



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the lesser relationships of life already created such an atmosphere; it is not impossible in international relationships.

There is an understanding between England and America which will bear almost anything. It would be impossible to make a war between France and America. The reasons for this are almost wholly to be sought in the region of sentiment, but they are not the less potent for all that. It lies within the power of the church to change the human atmosphere, to release new forces, to empower new ideals, to create new motives, to exalt and make effectual new methods. It will need patience, vision, insight, and, above all, an unfailing fidelity to the Gospel and spirit of Jesus Christ, to do that. It will not always be popular and never easy; but it can be done. And the great business of the church of the twentieth century is to do just that. It can lose its soul to find it again in no holier cause.

INTERNATIONAL LAW OR INTERNATIONAL ANARCHY?

By GUSTAV SPILLER, London, General Secretary,
International Union of Ethical Societies

IN MY first article on "The Impossibility of Limiting Armaments,"* I strove to show that lovers of international peace have little to hope for from the much-advertised proposal of a limitation and gradual reduction of armaments by mutual agreement. I reasoned that the constant stream of novel and improved implements of warfare introduced into this problem an incalculable factor of the first magnitude—as the war which is now proceeding indubitably demonstrates—and that therefore no treaty on the subject would be worth much more than the sheets of paper in which it is embodied. Indeed, Germany's sinister example of amassing in secret inventions and methods which only reach the common light at the psychological moment of opening hostilities or thereafter, is sure to be imitated, if only in self-defense, and would thus render doubly nugatory any project of limiting armaments by mutual consent.

My second article, on "The Practicability of Abolishing Armaments,"† dealt with another world-honored fallacy, to wit, the argument of the "practical" man, that since a police force is indispensable in national life, it betokens deficient insight into affairs to imagine that we can do without force in international matters. So plausible does this contention appear, prior to being examined, that, on this account, the alternative proposal of abolishing armaments is almost invariably dismissed as wildly impracticable. Yet, as I indicated in the last article, when once we recognize that a State is a territorial unit, and is itself composed of territorial units—towns, districts, sub-States—the converse of the popular proposition reveals itself as correct. That is, since towns, districts, and sub-States are subject to law, but do not possess a single soldier, rifle, or cannon, nor ever dread that physical force will be applied to them, it follows, so I reasoned, that States themselves may well be subject to a system of laws which disposes over no

physical sanctions. Whilst, therefore, an effective reduction or limitation of armaments is impossible, the total abolition of armaments proves to be practicable and in complete accord with world-wide experience. Only when this truly pacific stage has been reached will the fear of other States and the temptation to be aggressive relax their hold on nations.

I desire now to direct attention in this last article to a third fallacy, no less menacing to a durable and endurable peace than the two preceding ones.

On the principle that half a loaf is better than none, men appear to reason that the shadow is a tolerable substitute for the substance. Instead of demanding an international legislature having the status of present-day national legislatures, they deem it expedient to ask for an international council of conciliation possessing only moral authority, and in lieu of an *international* law court of a similar standing to national ones, they are willing to accept one whose decisions may be disregarded with impunity. The super-practical politicians thus reveal themselves as super-dreamers.

Suppose, now, that a council and a court of arbitration, having no powers beyond expressing an opinion, were operative in some country, does any one question that gaunt anarchy would stalk abroad in that land and that the reign of physical force would be firmly rooted in consequence? It is the law's sanctions and its source which infinitely matter. Because we are on the whole satisfied with the nature of the laws, and are assured that they are effectively executed, we are ready to respect them.

Through many centuries, with painful slowness, we have developed legislatures capable of framing fairly just laws, and now it is suggested that some cabal—for it would be nothing else—should evolve a system of international laws, and should discuss grave international issues as they arise. The utmost that one can hope in this respect is that the projected international council would never meet, and thus save us from a new "concert" where narrow national interests would as surely predominate as in the old "concert." If we are to have a council, its constitution should reflect the most highly developed national legislatures, for these alone offer adequate safeguards that the end for which the international legislature is to be established will be, broadly speaking, attained.

Likewise, with the contemplated court of law. It must be one which inspires confidence, because it possesses the power of making its decisions respected. If this be lacking completely, or nearly so, the judges will not feel that their labors are worth while, and the nations will not invoke, except sometimes *pro forma*, or, in unimportant cases, the mediation of the judges. How could it be otherwise? Suppose some State is persuaded that it has been grievously wronged by some other State, and that circumstances make it evident that the decision of the judges will be flouted by the offender. Will that State wait for a year, or for an indefinitely long period, to secure justice, and will it reply to each new outrage with a fresh application which is again to be shelved by an oracular pronouncement after many months and years? Manifestly this conception of law is not only infantile, but outrageous, and not a State on this globe will take such a court seriously where momentous issues are involved.

* ADVOCATE OF PEACE for October, page 270.

† ADVOCATE OF PEACE for November, page 299.

We have just seen that dilatoriness as an established principle would defeat its own end. It is, however, contended that the party to a dispute which has justice on its side might well rely on the force of that public opinion which will support the judicial decision, and that delay provides time for the cooling of the overheated political atmosphere. Both these arguments appear to be without a basis in recent history. The actual crises of the last dozen years or so were unsuspected by the press and the public opinions concerned until disclosed by the course of events, and the alarms raised by the newspapers of various countries led to no crises whatever. That is, public opinion, naturally uninformed or ill-informed, plays no critical rôle in international politics: here real or spurious reasons of State decide the issue, and public opinion can but accept, with more or less grace, the conclusions of the competent or incompetent authorities. Nor can the experience of the last decade leave any doubt that an interested and odious agitation may be conducted with signal success for several years, and that party and national considerations will readily discount and denounce the judgment of a bench of Daniels.

Our inevitable conclusion is, therefore, that those who pin their faith to any compromises in matters international mistake the shadow of a loaf for half a loaf. It is impossible to limit armaments effectually; it is practicable to abolish them; the existence of armaments leads *necessarily* to competition in armaments, to espionage, to intrigues, to suspicions and hatred, to aggressive intentions, to crises, and to sanguinary conflicts; the absence of armaments leads, as with intra-national territorial units, to complete readiness to adjust differences without recourse to arms and to the elimination of aggressive intentions; the establishment of an impotent international council and an impotent international court will, almost certainly, leave anarchy securely saddled on the world; the establishment of an international legislature and court of an equivalent status to the national legislatures and courts of the most civilized nations, meting out justice as justice is meted out between intra-territorial units, would once and for all ensure

a durable and durable peace and friendly cooperation between all peoples.

The rejoinder commonly made to the above line of reasoning is that the proposal is revolutionary, and that it slurs the fact of progress proceeding by increments. To this idol of presumed practicality we are to offer up millions of our youth and manhood for generations to come, and even the fabric of our civilization, which it has taken humanity thousands of years to raise. We plead, on our part, that the ideal and the practical coalesce in this instance; that our intra-territorial life has thoroughly prepared us for the true inter-territorial life; that in this particular case, as in myriad of kindred ones, there lies nothing between *either* and *or*; that the masses of mankind will eagerly respond to our appeal if we only have the wisdom and the courage to make it, and that it portends an evil day when in a supreme moment of history we shrink from proclaiming the saving truth.

The nations at the present juncture are almost in despair of the future, and are most reluctantly settling down to the conviction that there is nothing but their strong right arm to which they can trust. They view with undisguised concern the approaching time when military exigencies shall be more even than in the recent past the arbiters of the weal and woe of nations. The peoples of the Entente Powers and the neutral peoples, more particularly the United States, are sincerely desirous of slaying that monster of monsters, war. Shall we, then, fritter away the golden moments between now and the end of the war in disseminating views which must leave the patriot cold and every lover of humanity impatient? Should we not rather infuse in the suffering and bleeding peoples an inspiriting hope that there is a way out of the morass in which we have been sinking; that reason and conscience may soon rule the relations of peoples if we only grasp the truth that differences between territorial units should be composed by national territorial units—by recourse to authoritative methods analogous to those subsisting between intra-law and without resorting to arms?

BRIEF PEACE NOTES

. . . A conference of over seventy peace workers was held at the Broadway Tabernacle, New York City, October 26-27. Editorial reference to this conference appears elsewhere in these columns. Sessions were presided over by Frederick Lynch, Hamilton Holt, James Brown Scott, and Arthur D. Call. The secretaries of the conference were Henry S. Haskins and Henriette Neuhaus. The committee on resolutions were: Sidney L. Gulick, Samuel T. Dutton, Grace Abbott, Fannie Fern Andrews, and Charles H. Levermore. The continuation committee appointed by the conference, empowered to add to its number, were: Jane Addams, Arthur D. Call, Samuel T. Dutton, Sidney L. Gulick, Hamilton Holt, Frederick Lynch, Lucia Ames Mead, James Brown Scott, and Lillian D. Wald. The continuation committee held its first meeting in New York, November 1. Those in attendance were: Messrs. Call,

Dutton, Gulick, Holt, Lynch, and Mrs. Mead. The questionnaire is practically completed, and will soon be sent to the conferees and to the trustees and directors of peace societies. A larger and more official conference of peace workers will be held early during the coming year.

. . . Mr. Harold F. McCormick, son-in-law of John D. Rockefeller, recently returned from a year of experiences in Switzerland. Mr. McCormick proposes a plan by which he believes peace may be restored to Europe, or at least more easily attained. The most interesting feature of the plan is that the belligerents, while continuing to conceal, as they are bound to do, their strategic plans, shall be asked to enumerate the objects for which they are fighting, and place their peace terms in precise and concrete form in the hands of selected neu-